

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 25, 26, 28, 29, 31-37, 39-42 and 44-47 are pending with claims 1, 2, 4-7, 25, 33 and 34 being independent. Claims 3, 8, 10, 13, 16-24, 27, 30, 38 and 43 have been canceled and claims 1, 2, 4-7, 25, 33, 34 and 35 have been amended. Support for the amendments may be found in the application at, for example, Figs. 3 and 5. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 33, 34, 45 and 46 have been rejected as being unpatentable over McAuliffe (U.S. Patent No. 5,838,790) in view of Taguchi (U.S. Patent No. 6,148,253). With respect to claim 33 and its dependent claim 45, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither McCauliffe, Taguchi, nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests a display device and a portable information terminal arranged in the manner recited in claim 33 and where the display device has a first display portion and the portable information equipment has a second display portion, as also recited in claim 33. The rejection contends that McAuliffe discloses, at col. 4, line 35 to col. 5, line 67, having a server send a commercial advertisement or a public service announcement stored in a database to a display device as information, and displaying the commercial advertisement or the public service announcement on the display device when the server does not receive a search signal from a portable information equipment. However, McAuliffe, at col. 5, lines 40-43, discloses that the e-mail system of the representative embodiment stores advertisements at the user's client computer 2 so that the advertisements can be displayed when the client computer 2 is not on-line. Thus, the client computer 2 displays advertisements and also sends a search signal to the server system 4, and, as such, would need to constitute both the display device and the portable information terminal. However, even if the display portion of the client computer 2 is treated as the recited display device, there is no other portion of the client computer 2 (e.g., the memory) that includes a second display portion and could qualify as the recited portable information terminal. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 34 similarly recites portable information equipment having a first display portion and a display device having a second display portion. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 34 and

its dependent claim 46 should be withdrawn for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 33.

Claims 2, 4, 37 and 39 have been rejected as unpatentable over Bennett (U.S. Patent No. 6,615,172) in view of Taguchi. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither Bennett, Taguchi, nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests portable information equipment having a first display portion and a display device having a second display portion, as recited in claims 2 and 4. As best understood, the rejection contends that the client device 150 of Bennett constitutes both the portable information equipment and the display device. However, since the client device 150 includes only a single display portion, this cannot be the case. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 5, 6, 35, 40, 41 and 47 have been rejected as unpatentable over Braden-Harder (U.S. Patent No. 5,933,822) in view of Taguchi. With respect to claim 5, the rejection contends that Braden-Harder discloses portable information equipment capable of two-way communication with the server (Client PC 300 in Fig. 2), and a display device for receiving information sent by the server (col. 9, lines 1-67). With respect to claim 6, the rejection contends that Braden-Harder discloses portable information equipment capable of two-way communication with the first server (col. 19, line 27 to col. 20, line 30), and a display device for receiving and displaying information from the first server (col. 19, line 27 to col. 20, line 30). However, Braden-Harder discloses that the user enters a query 201 to the browser which, in turn, sends the query, via system 300 and through the Internet connection to server 220, to search engine 225 (see col. 8, lines 62-65) and that the browser presents the user with the search results 203 (see col. 9, lines 25-29). Thus, the client PC 300 of Braden-Harder sends a search signal to the server 220 and also receives a search result from the server 220. Accordingly, the rejection requires the client PC 300 to constitute both the portable information equipment and the display device. However, since the client PC 300 includes only a single display portion, it cannot constitute both the portable information equipment having a first display portion which is capable of two-way communication with the server and a display device having a second display portion for receiving information sent by the server, as recited in claims 5, 6 and 35. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 25, 26, 28, 29 and 44 have been rejected as unpatentable over Braden-Harder in view of Ramasubramani (U.S. Patent No. 6,516,316) and Taguchi. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because, as discussed above, Braden-Harder does not describe or suggest portable information equipment having a first display portion and a display device having a second display portion, as recited in claim 25, and because Ramasubramani, which is cited as showing the sending of an identification signal, does not remedy this failure.

Claims 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 31, 32 and 42 have been rejected as unpatentable over Braden-Harder in view of Ramasubramani, McAuliffe and Taguchi. Independent claim 7 has been amended to recite a portable information equipment having a first display portion and a display device having a second display portion. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection for the reasons discussed above.

Claims 1, 2, 36 and 37 have been rejected as unpatentable over Braden-Harder in view of Ramasubramani, Teare (U.S. Patent No. 6,151,624), and Taguchi. Similarly to claim 2, claim 1 recites portable information equipment having a first display portion and a display device having a second display portion. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection for the reasons noted above and because Teare, which is cited as showing means for charging an information provision fee, does not remedy the failure of Braden-Harder, Ramasubramani and Taguchi to describe or suggest portable information equipment having a first display portion and a display device having a second display portion, as recited in claims 1 and 2.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

The fee in the amount of \$910 for the request for continued examination fee (\$790) and the one-month extension fee (\$120) is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

7/31/06

**Customer No. 26171**

Fish & Richardson P.C.


1425 K Street, N.W. - 11th Floor

Washington, DC 20005-3500

Telephone: (202) 783-5070

Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40352658.doc

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John F. Hayden  
Reg. No. 37,640